

For one, Members should know the rationale for giving nonviolent criminals priority for training under the green jobs bill. Members also should know why the majority choose to circumvent the successful one stop program and instead insist the training for green jobs be provided through an entirely new and separate line of programs. Finally, Members should know why labor unions are given special treatment under this bill, when the local workforce investment boards and the business community, those that actually provide jobs, are left out in the cold.

Unfortunately, we will never get an answer to these or any other questions about green jobs on the minds of Members, because this language has been rushed to the floor. As a result, it will make our job training system more cumbersome and less efficient for both green jobs training and any other training delivered through the workforce investment system.

Mr. Chairman, before I conclude, I also must note my continued strong opposition to the majority's insistence on including controversial Davis-Bacon wage mandates in both this and other bills forced through the House this year.

Davis-Bacon wages violate capitalist values of free markets and competition, and they can inflate costs of projects by as much as 15 percent, costs that get passed on to taxpayers. Moreover, they force private companies to do millions of dollars more in excess administrative work each year.

At a time when we should be encouraging more investment in our energy infrastructure, as this bill purports to do, expanding this mandate is an unwise course, and one, I might add, that was never considered before the committee of jurisdiction, the Education and Labor Committee.

For these and other reasons, Mr. Chairman, I cannot support H.R. 3221, the Democrat Energy Scarcity Bill; and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), subcommittee ranking member on the Committee on Education and Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. McKEON.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this legislation. We have heard from many of our colleagues this morning about the flaws of this legislation across a range of policy areas. I would like to focus on one in particular that concerns many Members of the Committee on Education and Labor, and particularly the subcommittee on which I serve as ranking Republican, the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections. That issue is, of course, that the application of Davis-Bacon prevailing wage requirements, which is expanded no less than five times in this bill.

I submitted an amendment to the Rules Committee which would have conditioned the effective dates of the Davis-Bacon expansions in this bill on the completion of a study by the GAO to determine how effective the Davis-Bacon wage system is, and in particular whether progress was being made on improving its known flaws. I will give my colleagues some background.

In 2004, the Department of Labor's Office of Inspector General examined the Wage and Hour Division's attempt to update the Davis-Bacon wage-gathering system, a system that the Department of Labor spent \$22 million updating. The results were troubling.

The IG report stated: "Wage and fringe benefit data supplied wage and hour, and used in its surveys continue to have inaccuracies and may be biased. Further, prevailing wage decisions developed from the data are not timely."

Indeed, the problems identified are dramatic. My amendment simply would have required the Government Accountability Office to examine the status of the Department of Labor's efforts to remedy these identified flaws and make progress implementing the IG's suggested reforms before we expand Davis-Bacon wages and its associated costs in the wholly new areas of law.

That is why I submitted my amendment to rules and why I am disappointed we are not debating it today. The Wilson amendment may not have solved all of the problems in this bill, but it would have at least made an effort to correct one significant issue that we know sorely needs fixing.

As the Democrat Congress endeavors to expand Davis-Bacon into unprecedented areas under this bill, states and private parties receiving loan guarantees, grants and bonds will now be required to comply with the act. That is an unprecedented expansion beyond the original purposes of the act. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

(Mr. BOUCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House creates broad energy efficiencies. Taken together, our 29 separate energy efficiency provisions will reduce future greenhouse gas emissions by a total of 8.4 billion tons cumulatively through the year 2030. In the year 2030 alone, the reduction will be fully 700 million tons, and that is an amount equal to all of the vehicles on America's roads today.

The efficiency provisions are truly a major step forward in advancing American energy policy. They set new standards for lighting that is many multiples in advance of today's standards. They set higher standards for future models of an array of consumer products, ranging from refrigerators, freezers, dishwashers, clothes washers, resi-

dential boilers, electric motors and furnace fans. They promote green buildings, both in the public sector and also in the private sector. They create a process to capture much of the heat that today is wasted from industrial sites, enabling as much as 60 gigawatts of electricity generation from that energy.

The bill before us is a landmark accomplishment. It will make America more energy efficient and more energy independent.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. I would say to the gentleman from Texas that we do not have other speakers on this side, except for the potential to close on this side at the end of this debate.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. What is the intention of the controller of the time for the Energy and Commerce Committee on the majority? Are you about to yield back? Are you going to reserve?

Mr. BOUCHER. If the gentleman would yield, we are reserving the balance of our time. We do not have additional speakers on this side for general debate. We do reserve the potential for a brief close in general debate, but that will be the extent of general debate on our side.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Then, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of the Energy and Commerce time on the minority side until the end of the general debate.

Mr. BOUCHER. If the gentleman from Texas would yield again for a moment, what we are attempting to do actually is facilitate the debate. At this point in time, if the gentleman is prepared to use his time, we would yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. All right. Then I would yield myself 5½ minutes, with the understanding, I want to make sure before I do this Mr. BOUCHER or Mr. DINGELL or some member of the Energy and Commerce Committee is going to speak after I speak. Is that correct?

Mr. BOUCHER. No, I would say to the gentleman from Texas that we are prepared at this point to yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Then I will yield myself, I believe I have 5½ minutes, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

The gentleman is recognized.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first let me say some positive things. I want to commend Chairman DINGELL and Subcommittee Chairman BOUCHER for the number of hearings that they have held on this issue in this Congress and this committee. I want to commend them for the draft that they circulated earlier this year in which they attempted to put forward a bipartisan energy bill that actually had real energy in it. Unfortunately, the draft that Subcommittee